

E - 346,090

S - 744,732

NOV 21 1972

# Ellsberg Traces History Of Viet Escalation

Daniel Ellsberg is known as a highly serious, even solemn individual, but Ellsberg had to smile at the news about Bernard Barker, the CIA graduate whose job was to cool off hot checks for the Committee to Re-elect the President.

In Miami yesterday, a criminal court judge really threw the book at Bernard Barker. He sentenced him to 60 days on probation and took away his notary public's seal.

"And still it was more than Lavelle got," said Daniel Ellsberg dryly.

## Tax-Free Punishment

What John D. Lavelle got for authorizing 24 bombing raids over North Vietnam at a time when the U. S. Air Force was not supposed to be bombing North Vietnam at all was retirement on a general's pension, most of it tax-free.

Ellsberg, because he took it upon himself to let the Congress and the public know how successive administrations from Truman to Nixon had deceived them concerning our aims and intentions in Vietnam, could spend the rest of his life behind bars.

Sometime between now and spring he will be tried on 15 counts for which the penalties add up to 115 years.

The chances of conviction, his lawyers tell him, are 50-50.

Ellsberg was in Pittsburgh yesterday to make a speech. It's the way he hustles money for his defense.

Since June, when his contract expired, he has not had a paycheck from the Rand Corporation, the brain factory the Pentagon uses in researching ideas the professional thinkers who advise the President run up the flagpole to see if they're red, white and blue. Ellsberg became sort of persona non grata with his bosses at Rand after concluding that one project he had worked on, a study of the U. S. decision-making in Vietnam, might be the whole country's business rather than a jillion-word memo for the eyes of the inner sanctum alone.

The result of his high-level bean spilling was the Pentagon Papers, published in bits and pieces last year by The New York Times and 18 other newspapers.

No maker of waves could look more subdued than Ellsberg. He has feverish blue eyes, but everything else about him — his voice, his manner, and his clothes — is muted. Yet though Ellsberg spoke quietly in the well of Du-

quense University's gloomy, impressive, concrete Student Union building last



Roy

McHugh

Columnist-at-large

night, what he said was dramatic and forceful.

Ellsberg gave the crowd of 500 or more a history lesson derived from the Pentagon Papers, which enlightened him on the origin of our involvement in Vietnam.

It was 1950, the year of Alger Hiss and Joe McCarthy and recriminations in this country over the loss of mainland China to the Communists — not a good year, Harry Truman and Dean Acheson felt, for losing Indochina too. So we supported the French attempt to re-establish authority there.

After that, Ellsberg said, every four years a crisis arose as the Communist North seemed on the verge of winning. Every four years a president of the United States had the choice of escalating our help to the South and restoring the stalemate or of getting out. And every four years he escalated. The rule was: don't lose Indochina before the next election.

## Total U. S. Involvement

So Americans became accustomed to seeing American weapons killing Vietnamese and seeing it as acceptable, Ellsberg went on. Here was a Communist country invading a country we were obliged to support. But the Pentagon Papers convinced him that the regime in the South, far from being independent, was an American colonial government, its army supplied, equipped, clothed and paid by the U. S. in toto whereas the Russian-Chinese contribution to the war chest of the North was 10 per cent at the most.

Still quoting from the Pentagon Papers, he told how in 1963 the CIA, in the name of the American ambassador, abetted in the overthrow and murder of Ngo Dinh Diem, the dictator

we had set up and kept in power for eight years. He read about American presidents and generals expressing bafflement over the high morale of the Viet Cong and the low morale of the Vietnamese army the U. S. was pushing into combat.

"Maybe we're on the wrong side," said his boss in the State Department, John McNaughton, and last night Ellsberg's answer was, "No, we're not. We ARE the wrong side."

As Ellsberg talked, he warmed to his subject — literally. He took off his jacket and necktie, he rolled up his shirtsleeves.

He said he welcomes the rumors of peace. He said, "I didn't expect Nixon to do what he's doing. I thought he was a true believer in the domino theory, in the danger of bloodbaths and so on. It looks as though that was wrong."

And the reason for the change, Ellsberg believes, is that with George Wallace out of the picture the President has no fear of a right-wing backlash at the polls.

What the effect of four more years on his hope of acquittal would be, Ellsberg did not say. But noting that he obtained a delay in his trial because the Justice Department tapped his phone, he closed with the following thought:

"If Watergate should receive a mandate, if corruption in this campaign should be endorsed, if Nixon gets a second term, then Congress and the press and the courts can line up on the White House lawn the day after the election and salute and wait for orders."